

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 have been canceled and replaced by Claims 21-40. The newly added claims correspond to the canceled claims except for changes to correct minor clerical errors and to more fully comply with U.S. claims practice. In addition, component (b) of Claim 21 was amended to require the compound to be dissolved or dispersed in water as disclosed at page 13, lines 16-17. The remaining amendments will be discussed with regard to the following rejections.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because there is no antecedent basis for the term "respective component."

Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome by amending Claim 35 to require "introducing component (c) into component (a) during the preparation of component (a) or introducing component (c) into component (b) during the preparation of component (b)." This language is supported by canceled Claim 15. Introducing component (c) during the preparation of component (a) or (b) into the "respective component" means that when component (c) is to be added to component (a), it is added during the preparation of component (a) and when component (c) is to be added to component (b), it is added during the preparation of component (b). In view of the amendments to Claim 35 withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 3 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not being enabling in view of the phrase "and modification thereof."

Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome by deleting the rejected phrase. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-8 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-15 and 17-19 of copending Application No. 10/783,885, which has since issued as U.S. Patent 7,041,768. The Examiner contends that the practice of the instantly claimed

invention is rendered obvious by the large overlap in scope with the copending claims.

Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome by filing the attached terminal disclaimer. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, and in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Thomas W. Roy  
Thomas W. Roy  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 29,582

Bayer MaterialScience LLC  
100 Bayer Road  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741  
(412) 777-3820  
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:  
(412) 777-3902

f:\shared\kpl\twr402.ame